

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 \* \* \*

7 LARIME TAYLOR,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
11 DEPARTMENT, et al.,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:19-CV-995 JCM (NJK)

ORDER

13  
14 Presently before the court is the matter of *Taylor v. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police*  
15 *Department et al.*, case number 2:19-cv-00995-JCM-NJK.

16 On November 7, this court issued an order that granted defendants Las Vegas  
17 Metropolitan Police Department's ("LVMPD"), Sherriff Lombardo, Thomas Albright, Jacob  
18 Bittner, Darrell Lee Davies, Weston Ferguson, Jake Freeman, Janette Gutierrez, Matthew  
19 Kravetz, Christopher Longi, Morgan McClary, Clint Owensby, Gerardo Reyes, Robert Thorne,  
20 Theron Young's (collectively "the LVMPD defendants") motion to dismiss in part and denied it  
21 in part. (ECF No. 84).

22 ("LVMPD") and Sherriff Lombardo filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff Larime Taylor's  
23 ("plaintiff") second amended complaint. (ECF No. 83). Defendants Thomas Albright, Jacob  
24 Bittner, Darrell Lee Davies, Weston Ferguson, Jake Freeman, Janette Gutierrez, Matthew  
25 Kravetz, Christopher Longi, Morgan McClary, Clint Owensby, Gerardo Reyes, Robert Thorne,  
26 Theron Young (collectively "the LVMPD officers") also filed a motion to dismiss the second  
27 amended complaint. (ECF No. 82).  
28

1 The substance of both motions to dismiss is identical to the substance of defendants'  
2 motion to dismiss plaintiff's first amended complaint. (*Compare* ECF Nos. 82; 83, *with* ECF  
3 No. 21). Because the first and second amended complaints are identical,<sup>1</sup> the court addressed the  
4 defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiff's first amended complaint as it pertained to plaintiff's  
5 second amended complaint. (*See* ECF No. 84). Because the court already addressed the merits  
6 of the defendants' motions, the court denies the new motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 82, 83)  
7 without prejudice.

8 Further, the court's November 7 order indicated that it granted Clark County's motion to  
9 dismiss plaintiff's first amended complaint in part and denied it in part. However, the court's  
10 November 7 order dismissed all pending claims against the county. Accordingly, Clark  
11 County's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 15) should have been granted in full. Clark County is  
12 hereby dismissed as a defendant.

13 Accordingly,

14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that LVMPD and Sherriff  
15 Lombardo's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 83) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without  
16 prejudice.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the LVMPD officers' motion to dismiss (ECF No. 82)  
18 be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in light of the court's November 7 order dismissing all  
20 claims against defendant Clark County, the county is DISMISSED as a defendant in this case.

21 DATED November 13, 2019.

22   
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

<sup>1</sup> The only amendment was including two of the LVMPD officers' first names.